

REMARKS

In the Office Action ("OA"), the Examiner rejected claims 1-8 under U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Smith, Jr. ("Smith"), U.S. Patent No. 6,836,667 B1.


Smith does not anticipate claimed invention as recited in claims 1-8. According to MPEP § 2131, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)."

With regard to claim 1, Smith does not teach or motivate the limitation "wherein said messages are associated with a specific coordinate way point and are not associated with a specific subscriber within said network." The messages taught by Smith are associated with a user and not a location as presently claimed. Claim 8 recites a similar limitation.

Since Smith does not anticipate claim 1, and by virtue of their dependency, Smith cannot anticipate claims 2-7.

Applicant submits that the present claims are in condition for allowance and request entry of this amendment, reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,


Christopher M. Tucker
Reg. No. 48,783
Agent for Applicant

Date Mailed: May 09, 2006